



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## SOME *ROLAND* EMENDATIONS

---

It is well understood that the unstressed pronouns *me*, *te*, etc., do not regularly stand after a pause or begin the sentence in Old French, and that this is also true of the adverbs *i* and *en*, the position of all these words being that of enclitics, not of proclitics. It is intelligible that sooner or later they came to be used also as proclitics, and yet may have continued to preserve, and perhaps for a considerable time, the old position in the sentence. The words *Nen i ad cel* (*Roland*, 2545) may serve as a starting point from which it may be argued that this process began in the course of the twelfth century, if not even earlier, in the case of *i* and probably of *en*. I am here concerned only with the *Roland* as seen in the Anglo-French of the Oxford manuscript, and with the probable early form of the poem near the beginning of the twelfth century.

Neither *Nen i ad cel* (vs. 2545) nor *Cel nen i ad* (vss. 822 and 1618) can cause any difficulty as being peculiar; the form *nen* before a vowel is well enough known as old, and *cel* (or *icel*) is the normal original form of the accusative. But when we find *N'i<sup>1</sup> ad celoï* at the beginning of vs. 411 we may well pause to examine this and other instances of the impersonal expression with the negative and the pronoun *cel*, *icel*, or *celui*. Not that the shorter form *ne* does not often occur, and this before a vowel naturally becomes *n'*, but obviously *nen* is the older form, and one is tempted to restore *nen* whenever possible in this position in the *Roland* text, especially in this expression, which occurs so often as to give the impression of being one of the so-called epic formulas. That it is a formula—not necessarily an epic formula—or at least was in common idiomatic use, appears from the fact that it is found in *Alexis*, vs. 555, *Cel nen i at* (MS L has *Cel nen niat*), where Paris printed *Cel n'en i at* (so also in the edition of 1911); cf. also vs. 554, *Nul(s) nen i at*. For an example in continental Old French see Chrétien's *Ivain*, vs. 6132, in Foerster's edition, *N'i a celui, ne soit blechiez*, where the

<sup>1</sup> I print *N'i* for convenience; of course the manuscript has *Ni* (strictly speaking *N i*).  
143]

absence of *en* before *i* indicates that *nen* is to be preferred to *n'en* in the *Alexis* line as in the *Roland*, for this formula. At least it seems best to restore *nen* when *N'i* or perhaps *N'en* (the *en* from *i n d e*) occurs at the beginning of a *Roland* line. The negative, to be sure, in *N'i* or *N'en* still stands before the *i*, which does not technically begin the sentence, but *ne* is reduced to the consonant *n*, and the *i* (or *en*) makes in pronunciation with the *n* the first syllable of the line; phonetically considered *ni* is the first word. This means that if the sentence begins with *N'i* the *i* is really proclitic, and the case for *N'en* is similar. The grammatical terms "enclitic" and "proclitic" have no sense except as referring to pronunciation. Moreover in such a formula the fuller form *nen* is likely to have been longer preserved than elsewhere.

This situation—*N'i* at the beginning of the line—is presented in the Oxford MS for our formula in vss. 411, 1803, 1814, 1836, 3462, all of which show *N'i ad celoi*, easily corrected to *Nen i ad cel*, as in 2545; and in 1845 and 3540 *N'i ad icel*, readily changed to the same *Nen i ad cel*. In 3418 *Ne niad cel* is the MS reading. Stengel prints *Ne n'i ad cel*, but *Nen i ad cel* seems to be the true form. In 3805 *Neni ad celoi* is in the MS; Stengel has *N'i ad celui* but *Nen i ad cel* seems better. Including 2545 (and also 822 and 1618 in which *Cel* begins the line) we find twelve cases of our formula, ten with *Nen i ad cel*, two with *Cel nen i ad*, if my corrections are acceptable.

Should we take another step and change every line beginning with *N'i ad* or *N'en ad*, whatever word follows as the object of *ad*? Also we might notice a few cases not showing the impersonal *ad*. The following examples may be noticed: in vss. 22, 854, 960, *N'i ad paien*, one might read *Paien n'i ad*; in 290, *Jo i puis aler*, where Stengel has *J'i puis aler*, perhaps *Puis i aler* or *Aler i puis*; in 755, *N'i perdrat Carles li reis ki France tient*, perhaps *Nen i perdrat Carles* [or *li reis*] *ki France tient*; in 758, *Neni perdrat*, that is, *Nen i perdrat*, though Stengel's *Ne n'i perdrat* is also possible; in 810, *N'en descendrat*, possibly *Ne descendrat*, cf. 1751; in 1522, *N'i ad echipre*, perhaps *Nen est eschipse*, cf. 1555, *Beste nen est*, and 1733, *N'ert mais tel home*; in 1751, *N'en mangerunt*, perhaps to be changed to *Nes mangerunt*; or one might even think of *Ne 'n*, omitting the *e* of *en*

instead of the *e* of *ne*; cf. *sin* for *si en*; in 2467, *Il neni ad barge ne drodmund ne caland* should probably be read *Nen i ad barge ne drodmund ne caland*; though Stengel's *Il n'i ad barge*, etc., is admissible, yet the older form without *il* seems better; in 2522, *N'i ad cheval*, perhaps *Cheval n'i ad*; in 2753, Stengel's *N'en irat Charles* is very likely wrong; it would be nearer the MS if we should read *Et puis li dites: il n'en irat sem creit*,<sup>1</sup> cf. 1728, *Sem creisez* (where a small *e* is added after *Sem* and above the line in Stengel's printing of the MS); in 3169, *N'i ad Franceis*, perhaps *Franceis n'i ad*; in 3665, *N'i remeindrat*, perhaps better *Nen i remaint*; in 3789, *N'i ad Frances*, cf. 3169; 3908, *Nen recrerrai*, where Stengel prints *N'en recrerrai*, should not improbably be *Nem recrerrai*; for the reflexive pronoun cf. 3892, *car te recreiz*.

It is, however, unsafe to make all these changes outside of our formula solely because *i* or *en* appears to be proclitic, for the proclitic use may be even older. In the *Alexis* as edited by Paris (I refer to the edition of 1911 in *Les Classiques français du moyen âge*) I find, vs. 3, *S'i ert credance* (in the editions of 1872 and 1885 he read *Si ert*, etc., but in 1903 *S'i* appears); 138, *N'i remest paile*; 165, *N'en vuelt torner*, which is closely connected in sense with what precedes; 430, *N'i out si dur*; 556, *N'i vient enfers*. Not all these half-lines lend themselves readily to emendation, and this throws doubt on the changes suggested in the preceding paragraph for vss. 22, etc., in the *Roland*. Still, I look on all these cases in the *Alexis* with some suspicion of alterations by copyists.

E. S. SHELDON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> This, it will be observed, avoids putting either *n'en* or an unstressed personal pronoun immediately after the caesural pause.